

REMARKS

Claims 8, 11 through 21, 24 and 25 are pending in the application. Claims 1 through 7, 9, 10, 22 and 23 have been canceled. Claims 8, 11, 15, 19 and 24 have been amended. Bases for the amendments may be found throughout the application, claims and drawings as originally filed and as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 8, 15, 19 and 24 have been amended to improve their form and to specify that the first and second inserts are located respective second bending mode anti-nodes.

Claim 11 has been amended in view of the cancellation of Claim 10 to depend from Claim 8.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sparrow (U.S. Pat. No. 2,017,609) in view of Wolfe (U.S. Pat. No. 3,659,434). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant notes that the Office both the Sparrow and the Wolfe references are directed to rotational balancing of a shaft and as such, do not relate to the damping of vibration resulting from a second order bending moment. Consequently, neither the Sparrow or Wolfe references teach or suggest the placement of an insert at a second bending mode anti-node.

In view of the above-remarks, Applicant submits that the combination of the Sparrow and Wolfe references does not render Applicant's invention obvious. As neither the Sparrow or the Wolfe references teach or suggest the location of an insert at a second bending mode anti-node, this combination fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claims 8, 15, 19 and 24.


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 8, 15, 19 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 22, 2004

By: 

Michael D. Zalobsky
Reg. No. 45,512

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600